

REMARKS:Claims 1, 2-4, 6, 22, 28

Claims 1, 2-4, 6, 22, and 28 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kikuta et al. (US2002/0027733).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the shock prediction mechanism further predicts a shock with reference to a history of input operations provided by a predetermined input device, the input device receiving input directly from a human user. Examples of this

Claim 1 has been amended to require that the shock prediction mechanism analyze both current information as well as historical information received immediately prior to the current information.

Kikuta uses a shock scale/component extractor 10 to capture the extent of an actual shock. See [0028]. The extent of the shocks are stored in a history manager 14 "as a history of the occurrence of shock." See [0030]. This stored shock data can then be used as a learning function as the history of occurrence of a shock. See [0037].

However, Kikuta is silent as to analyzing a history immediately prior to the current information. Rather, Kikuta appears to compare current readings of the shock sensor 1 to a threshold value, and if it exceeds the threshold, the read/write function is inhibited. See [0026]. In fact, Kikuta allows the user to set a level so that "harmless and slow vibrations" are not detected. See [0040]. This implies that only instantaneous data is analyzed, and the threshold merely adjusted based on cumulative data from past shocks. Thus, the history stored by Kikuta is of past shocks only, and not of data received just prior to the current data.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Kikuta and the other art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also believed to be allowable.

In addition, claim 2 has been amended to recite that the time period for the

HIT1P142/JP920020150US1

history is longer than an anticipated time required for a fall of the magnetic disk device. Support for this amendment is found on p. 27, line 22 to p. 28, line 3.

Further, claim 4 has been amended to require that the input device is selected from a keyboard and a mouse which is in turn coupled to a computer system which is in communication with the magnetic disk device. Support for this amendment is found at p. 27, lines 4-7 and p. 28, lines 18-20. This feature is not found in the prior art of record.

Claim 22 has been amended in a manner similar to allowed claim 17, and is believed to be allowable for the same reason as allowed claim 17.

Claim 28 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and is believed to be allowable for the same reason as claim 1.

Claims 5, 7, 8

Claim 5, 7, and 8 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuta in view of Ishiyama et al. (2003/0067705).

Because claim 1 as amended is believed to be allowable over Kikuta, and Ishiyama has merely been added to show additional features, claims 5, 7, and 8 are also believed to be allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 5, 7, and 8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-13, 15-21, 23-27

Applicants acknowledge and appreciate allowance of claims 9-13, 15-21, and 23-27.

Claim 29

New claim 29 has been added to further define and vary the scope of the present invention. Claim 29 mimics the elements of allowed claim 17.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 971-2573. For payment

HIT1P142/JP920020150US1

of any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2587 (Order No. JP920020150US1).

Respectfully submitted,

By: DK Date: 6/30/15
Dominic M. Kotab
Reg. No. 42,762

Zilka-Kotab, PC
P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, California 95172-1120
Telephone: (408) 971-2573
Facsimile: (408) 971-4660

HIT1P142/JP920020150US1

- 14 -